

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-47 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-19 and 21-46 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments and the newly added claims can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-47 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment.

No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,281 (hereinafter “Chen”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,500 (hereinafter “Qureshi”), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,635,982 (hereinafter “Zhang”).

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-47 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Chen in view of Qureshi and Zhang. The Office Action alleges that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter in that the combination of Chen, Qureshi, and Zhang expressly or impliedly disclose or suggest the claimed invention. The Office Action also attempts to provide a line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of Chen, Qureshi, and Zhang.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the evidence presented in the Office Action. As reiterated by the Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR), 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), the framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is stated in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). The factual inquiries enunciated by the Court are as follows:

(A) Determining the scope and content of the prior art;

(B) Ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art;

and

(C) Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

To reach a proper determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical “person of ordinary skill in the art” when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. In view of all factual information, the Examiner must then make a determination whether the claimed invention “as a whole” would have been obvious at that time to that person. (M.P.E.P. § 2142).

Applicants respectfully submit that Chen, Qureshi, and Zhang, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-47. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-47 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, amended claim 1 recites a method performed by a presentation recorder device that includes the feature of “communicating at least a portion of the presentation representation from the presentation recorder device to one or more devices, the communicated portion of the presentation representation including one or more keyframes from the set of keyframes and a portion of the textural information.” As recited in amended claim 1, first information and second information are analyzed at the presentation recorder device to extract the textual information from the first information or the second information using one or more text recognition techniques. The presentation representation is generated of the first information and the second information at the presentation recorder device. The presentation representation as recited in amended claim 1 includes a representation of each keyframe in the set of keyframes and the textual information extracted by the presentation recorder device from the first information or the second information.

Chen, Qureshi, and Zhang, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose the feature of “communicating at least a portion of the presentation representation from the presentation recorder device to one or more devices, the communicated portion of the presentation representation including one or more keyframes from the set of keyframes and a portion of the textural information” as recite in amended claim 1. Chen fails to disclose that on-demand presentation module 310 generates a presentation representation of first information and

second information as recited in amended claim 1 where the presentation representation includes a representation of each keyframe in the set of keyframes and textual information extracted by the on-demand presentation module 310 from the first information or the second information. Chen further fails to disclose that on-demand presentation module 310 analyzes the first information and the second information to extract textual information from the first information or the second information using one or more text recognition techniques. Qureshi and Zhang fail to cure the above deficiencies of Chen.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the failure of Chen, Qureshi, and Zhang, either individually or in combination, to disclose the above recited features in claim 1 is a substantial difference that establish that the subject matter as a whole of claim 1 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 14, 27, and 40 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-13, 15-26 and 44, 28-39, and 41-43 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/728,453  
Amdt. dated October 15, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2008

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
61350128 v1